

REMARKS

The Official Action dated 24 August 2004 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claim 9 is rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by German patent 908,327.

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 5 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 5 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9 are dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3.

Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 7.

Claim 9 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-9 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner NICHOLSON are

appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.